execution and observation of them. The former of * which being a thing plainly absurd and ridiculous, and the latter that, which these philosophers themselves are extremely abhorrent from, we cannot make any other conclusion than this, that they do but unskilfully and unawares establish that very thing, which in words they oppose; and that their laws of nature concerning motion are really nothing else but a plastic nature, acting upon the matter of the whole corporeal universe, both maintaining the same quantity of motion always in it, and also dispensing it (by transferring it out of one body into another) according to such laws, fatally impressed upon it. Now, if there be a plastic nature, that governs the motion of matter every where, according to laws, there can be no reason given, why the same might not also extend farther to the regular disposal of that matter, in the formation of plants and animals, and other things, in order to that apt coherent frame and harmony of the whole universe.

Q. And as this plastic nature is a thing, which seems to be in itself most reasonable, so hath it also had the suffrage of the best philosophers in all ages. For, first, it is well known, that Aristotle concerns himself in nothing more zealously than this, that mundane things are not effected merely by the necessary and unguided motion of matter, or by fortuitous mechanism; but by such a nature as acts regularly and artificially for ends; yet so as that this nature is not the highest principle ^either, or the supreme Numen, but subordinate to a perfect mind or intellect; he affirming, that

vowc euriov /cat *(j>vaig* rovSc *rov* Travroc, that mind, together with nature, was the cause of this universe;